

REMARKS

In the patent application, claims 1-27 are pending. In the office action, claims 1, 6, 17-19 and 20 are rejected and claims 2-5, 7-16 and 21-27 are objected to but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form.

Applicant has amended claims 1, 17, 20 to include the further limitation that the predetermined rule is based on at least one linguistic characteristic of the syllables and the linguistic characteristic is associated with a musical note. The support for the amendment can be found at p.5, line 14 to p.6, line 5, for example. The linguistic characteristic can be a vowel, consonant, voiced/unvoiced intonation. No new matter has been introduced.

At section 3 of the office action, claims 1, 6, 17, 19 and 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102 as being anticipated by *Lynbrook et al.* (U.S. Patent No.4,731,847, hereafter referred to as *Lynbrook*). In rejecting these claims, the Examiner states that *Lynbrook* discloses a method and device as claimed.

It is respectfully submitted that *Lynbrook* discloses a method wherein a sequence of words are broken into a sequence of syllables which are matched to a sequence of pitch data (col.1, lines 42-44), and each syllable is combined with an associated pitch and preferably a duration (col.1, lines 61-62). However, *Lynbrook* only matches each syllable in the sequence to a note in a tune of a desired song. With such syllable-to-note matching, an operator is able to choose a popular tune such as “Mary had a Little Lamb”, “Twinkle, Twinkle Little Star” to associate with the textual material entered by the operator in order to simulate singing of song (col.4, lines 29 – 41). However, with the method as disclosed in *Lynbrook*, the same syllable may be matched to different pitches in a tune. For example, if the sequence of syllables “twinkle-twinkle-little-star” is matched to the first seven notes in the tune of “Somewhere over the rainbow” or C-C2-B-G-A-B-C2 (C2 is one octave over C), the syllables in the first “twinkle” are matched to C-C2 and the syllables in the second “twinkle” are matched to B-G. Thus, the same syllables are matched two different notes. This syllable-to-note matching is rather random, depending on what tune is selected to match what syllable sequence.

In contrast, the present invention is concerned with matching a syllable to a designated pitch under a predetermined rule. Thus, once a linguistic rule is determined, the same syllable is always matched to the same pitch, regardless of the sequence of syllables.

For the above reasons, claims 1, 17 and 20 are clearly distinguishable over the cited *Lynbrook* reference.

As for claims 6 and 19, they are dependent from claims 1 and 17 and recite features not recited in claims 1 and 17. For reasons regarding claims 1 and 17 above, it is respectfully submitted that claims 6 and 19 are also distinguishable over the cited *Lynbrook* reference.

CONCLUSION

Claims 2-5, 7-16, 18 and 21-27 are objected to but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form. Claims 1, 6, 17, 19 and 20, as amended, are allowable over the cited *Lynbrook* reference. Early allowance of claims 1, 6, 17, 19 and 20 is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,



Kenneth Q. Lao
Attorney for the Applicant
Registration No. 40,061

WARE, FRESSOLA, VAN DER SLUYS
& ADOLPHSON LLP
Bradford Green, Building Five
755 Main Street, P.O. Box 224
Monroe, CT 06468
Telephone: (203) 261-1234
Facsimile: (203) 261-5676
USPTO Customer No. 004955